

REMARKS

The Final Office Action of October 17, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully analyzed. Claims 19-22 remain pending in the application, of which claim 19 is an independent claim.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's acknowledgment of Applicants' request for continued examination under 37 C.F.R. §1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 C.F.R. §1.17(e), which was filed after the final rejection. Applicants further appreciate Examiner's entering of Applicants' submission filed on August 5, 2005.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,323,051, issued to Shimada, *et al.* ("Shimada"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

In order for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 to be proper, a single reference must disclose each and every claimed feature. To be patentable, a claim need only recite a single novel features that is not disclosed in the cited reference. Thus, the failure of a cited reference to disclose one or more claimed features renders the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection improper.

Shimada fails to teach each and every claimed feature as recited in independent claim 19, more particularly, Shimada fails to teach an active matrix display device, wherein the source/drain electrodes have a dual-layered structure of a transparent conductive layer and a metal layer, the metal layer being enclosed by the insulation film.

The Examiner alleges that Shimada teaches the active matrix display device, wherein the source/drain electrodes have a dual-layered structure of a transparent conductive layer and a metal layer, the metal layer being enclosed by the insulation film (See Office Action, on page pages 3 and 4, paragraphs 3 and 4). However, Shimada teaches away from an active matrix display device, wherein the source/drain electrodes have a dual-layered structure (See Shimada Figure 7; See col. 2, lines 1-10). Shimada teaches each TFT 121 comprises a high-resistance semiconductor film 104 which will be made into a source electrode S and a drain electrode D, a source metal film 106, a transparent conductive film 107, and a protective film 108, which are layered sequentially from bottom to top in this order. In other words, the source/drain electrodes of Shimada can be interpreted to have a single-layered structure comprising a high-resistance semiconductor film 104 which will be made into a source electrode S and a drain electrode D, or Shimada can be interpreted to have a tri-layered structure comprising a high-resistance semiconductor film 104 which will be made into a source electrode S and a drain electrode D, a source metal film 106, and a transparent conductive film 107, which are layered sequentially from top to bottom in that order (See Shimada, particularly col. 2, lines 4-10). Thus, Shimada fails to disclose each and every claim limitation recited in independent claim 19. Claims 20 and 21 depend from independent claim 19, which is an allowable claim for the reasons identified above, and hence dependent claims 20 and 21 are allowable at least because of their dependency from claim 19.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 19-21. Since none of the other prior art of record discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 19, and all the claims that depend therefrom, claims 20-21, are allowable.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In order to render a claim obvious, the combination of cited references must teach each and every element of the claimed invention and must provide teaching, motivation, or suggestion to combine. Nat'l Steel Car, Ltd. v. Canadian Pac. Rwy., 357 F.3d 1319, 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (citing Ecolochem, Inc. v. S. Cal. Edison Co., 227 F.3d 1361, 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2000)). This motivation must be based on the knowledge in the art, not knowledge provided by the application under examination, because such hindsight reconstruction is forbidden. In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 1075 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Shimada (U.S. Patent No. 6,323,051) in view of Shirasaki (U.S. Patent No. 5,895,692)

Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 6,323,051, issued to Shimada, *et al.* ("Shimada") in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,895,692, issued to Shirasaki, *et al.* ("Shirasaki"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

As noted above, Shimada fails to disclose each and every claim limitation as recited in independent claim 19, more particularly, Shimada fails to teach an active matrix display device, wherein the source/drain electrodes have a dual-layered structure of a transparent conductive layer and a metal layer, the metal layer being enclosed by the insulation film. Claim 22 depends from independent claim 19, which is an allowable claim. Further, Shirasaki fails to cure the deficiencies of Shimada noted above. Hence, dependent claim 22 is allowable at least because of its dependency from claim 19.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 22. Since none of the other prior art of record, whether taken alone or in any combination, discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 22 is allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submits that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Wayne M. Helge
56.905 for:

Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: January 17, 2006

CUSTOMER NUMBER: 58027

H.C. Park & Associates, PLC
8500 Leesburg Pike
Suite 7500
Vienna, VA 22182
Telephone No. (703) 288-5105
Facsimile No. (703) 288-5139

HCP:BYC:kbs